

Coherent configurations and triply regular association schemes obtained from spherical designs

Sho Suda

Division of Mathematics, Graduated School of Information Sciences, Tohoku University,
6-3-09 Aramaki-Aza-Aoba, Aoba-ku, Sendai 980-8579, Japan

March 30, 2009

Abstract

Delsarte-Goethals-Seidel showed that if X is a spherical t -design with degree s satisfying $t \geq 2s - 2$, X carries the structure of an association scheme. Also Bannai-Bannai showed that the same conclusion holds if X is an antipodal spherical t -design with degree s satisfying $t = 2s - 3$. As a generalization of these results, we prove that a union of spherical designs with a certain property carries the structure of a coherent configuration. We derive triple regularity of tight spherical 4, 5, 7-designs, mutually unbiased bases, linked symmetric designs with certain parameters.

1 Introduction

Spherical codes and designs were studied by Delsarte-Goethals-Seidel [10]. There are two important parameters of finite set X in the unit sphere S^{d-1} , that is, strength t and degree s . In the paper [10], it is shown that $t \geq 2s - 2$ implies X carries an s -class association scheme. Recently Bannai-Bannai [1] has shown that if X is antipodal and $t = 2s - 3$, then X carries an s -class association scheme.

Coherent configurations, that were introduced by D. G. Higman [11], are known as a generalization of association schemes. In Section 2, as an analogue of these results, we give a certain sufficient condition for a union of spherical designs to carry the structure of a coherent configuration. Our proof is based on the method of Delsarte-Goethals-Seidel [10, Theorem 7.4].

In Section 3, we consider triply regular association schemes which were introduced in connection with spin models by F. Jaeger [13] and have higher regularity than ordinary association schemes. Triple regularity is equivalent to the condition that the partition consisting of subconstituents relative to any point of the association scheme carries a coherent configuration whose parameters are independent of the point. In order to show that a symmetric association scheme is triply regular, we embed the scheme to the unit sphere S^{d-1} by a primitive idempotent. This embedding has a partition of derived designs in S^{d-2} for arbitrary point in the association scheme. Applying the main theorem of this paper to the union of derived designs, we obtain a sufficient condition for triple regularity of a symmetric association scheme.

In Sections 3–6, we consider tight spherical 4, 5, 7-designs, mutually unbiased bases (MUB), and linked symmetric designs with certain parameters. We note that tight spherical t -designs are classified except for $t = 4, 5, 7$. It is known that a tight spherical design, MUB, and a linked system of symmetric designs carry a symmetric association scheme [10, Theorem 7.4], [1, Theorem 1.1], [17]. We will show that these symmetric association schemes are triply regular using our main theorem.

2 Coherent configurations obtained from spherical designs

Let X be a finite set, we define $\text{diag}(X \times X) = \{(x, x) \mid x \in X\}$. Let $\{f_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a set of relations on X , we define $f_i^t = \{(y, x) \mid (x, y) \in f_i\}$. $(X, \{f_i\}_{i \in I})$ is a coherent configuration if the following properties are satisfied:

- (1) $\{f_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a partition of $X \times X$,
- (2) $f_i^t = f_{i^*}$ for some $i^* \in I$,
- (3) $f_i \cap \text{diag}(X \times X) \neq \emptyset$ implies $f_i \subset \text{diag}(X \times X)$,
- (4) for $i, j, k \in I$, the number $|\{z \in X \mid (x, z) \in f_i, (z, y) \in f_j\}|$ is independent of the choice of $(x, y) \in f_k$.

If moreover $f_0 = \text{diag}(X \times X)$ and $i^* = i$ for all $i \in I$, then we call $(X, \{f_i\}_{i \in I})$ a symmetric association scheme.

Let $X_1, \dots, X_n$ be finite subsets of S^{d-1} . We denote by $\coprod_{i=1}^n X_i$ the disjoint union of $X_1, \dots, X_n$. We denote by $\langle x, y \rangle$ the inner product of $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We define the nontrivial angle set $A(X_i, X_j)$ between X_i and X_j by

$$A(X_i, X_j) = \{\langle x, y \rangle \mid x \in X_i, y \in X_j, x \neq \pm y\},$$

and the angle set $A'(X_i, X_j)$ between X_i and X_j by

$$A'(X_i, X_j) = \{\langle x, y \rangle \mid x \in X_i, y \in X_j, x \neq y\}.$$

If $i = j$, then $A(X_i, X_i)$ (resp. $A'(X_i, X_i)$) is abbreviated $A(X_i)$ (resp. $A'(X_i)$).

We define the intersection numbers on X_j for $x, y \in S^{d-1}$ by

$$p_{\alpha, \beta}^j(x, y) = |\{z \in X_j \mid \langle x, z \rangle = \alpha, \langle y, z \rangle = \beta\}|.$$

For a positive integer t , a finite non-empty set X in the unit sphere S^{d-1} is called a spherical t -design in S^{d-1} if the following condition is satisfied:

$$\frac{1}{|X|} \sum_{x \in X} f(x) = \frac{1}{|S^{d-1}|} \int_{S^{d-1}} f(x) d\sigma(x)$$

for all polynomials $f(x) = f(x_1, \dots, x_d)$ of degree not exceeding t . Here $|S^{d-1}|$ denotes the volume of the sphere S^{d-1} . When X is a t -design and not a $(t+1)$ -design, we call t its strength.

We define the Gegenbauer polynomials $\{Q_k(x)\}_{k=0}^\infty$ on S^{d-1} by

$$\begin{aligned} Q_0(x) &= 1, \quad Q_1(x) = dx, \\ \frac{k+1}{d+2k} Q_{k+1}(x) &= xQ_k(x) - \frac{d+k-3}{d+2k-4} Q_{k-1}(x). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\text{Harm}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be the vector space of the harmonic polynomials over $\mathbb{R}$ and $\text{Harm}_l(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be the subspace of $\text{Harm}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ consisting of homogeneous polynomials of total degree l . Let $\{\phi_{l,1}, \dots, \phi_{l,h_l}\}$ be an orthonormal basis of $\text{Harm}_l(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with respect to the inner product

$$\langle \phi, \psi \rangle = \frac{1}{|S^{d-1}|} \int_{S^{d-1}} \phi(x) \psi(x) d\sigma(x).$$

Then the addition formula for the Gegenbauer polynomial holds [10, Theorem 3.3]:

Lemma 2.1. $\sum_{i=1}^{h_l} \phi_{l,i}(x)\phi_{l,i}(y) = Q_l(\langle x, y \rangle)$ for any $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $x, y \in S^{d-1}$.

We define the l -th characteristic matrix of a finite set $X \subset S^{d-1}$ as the $|X| \times h_l$ matrix

$$H_l = (\phi_{l,i}(x))_{\substack{x \in X \\ 1 \leq i \leq h_l}}.$$

A criterion for t -designs using Gegenbauer polynomials and the characteristic matrices is known [10, Theorem 5.3, 5.5].

Lemma 2.2. *Let X be a finite set in S^{d-1} . The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) X is a t -design,
- (2) $\sum_{x,y \in X} Q_k(\langle x, y \rangle) = 0$ for any $k \in \{1, \dots, t\}$,
- (3) $H_k^t H_l = \delta_{k,l} |X| I$ for $0 \leq k + l \leq t$,

We define $\{f_{\lambda,l}\}_{l=0}^{\lambda}$ as the coefficients of Gegenbauer expansion of x^{λ} for any nonnegative integers λ , i.e., $x^{\lambda} = \sum_{l=0}^{\lambda} f_{\lambda,l} Q_l(x)$, and let $F_{\lambda,\mu}(x) = \sum_{l=0}^{\min\{\lambda,\mu\}} f_{\lambda,l} f_{\mu,l} Q_l(x)$, where λ, μ are nonnegative integers.

The following three lemmas are used to prove Theorem 2.6 by using uniqueness of the solution of linear equations. Let A be a square matrix of size n . For index sets $I, J \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$, we denote the submatrix that lies in the rows of A indexed by I and the columns indexed by J as $A(I, J)$ and the complement of I as I' . If $I = \{i\}$ and $J = \{j\}$, then $A(I, J)$ is abbreviated $A(i, j)$. A lemma which relates a minor of A^{-1} to that of A is the following:

Lemma 2.3. [12, p.21] *Let A be a nonsingular matrix, and let I, J be index sets of rows and columns of A with $|I| = |J|$. Then*

$$\det A^{-1}(I', J') = (-1)^{\sum_{i \in I} i + \sum_{j \in J} j} \frac{\det A(J, I)}{\det A}.$$

We define the k -th elementary symmetric polynomial $e_k(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ in n variables $x_1, \dots, x_n$ by

$$e_k(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k = 0, \\ \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq n} x_{i_1} x_{i_2} \dots x_{i_k} & \text{if } k \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

We define the polynomial $a_{\lambda}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ for a partition $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ by

$$a_{\lambda}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \epsilon(\sigma) x_{\sigma(1)}^{\lambda_1} \dots x_{\sigma(n)}^{\lambda_n},$$

and the Schur function $S_{\lambda}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ by

$$S_{\lambda}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \frac{a_{\lambda+\delta}(x_1, \dots, x_n)}{a_{\lambda}(x_1, \dots, x_n)},$$

where $\delta = (n-1, n-2, \dots, 1, 0)$.

Lemma 2.4. *Let A be a square matrix of order n with (i, j) entry α_j^{i-1} , where $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ are distinct. Then*

$$A^{-1}(i, j) = (-1)^{i+j} \frac{e_{n-j}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{i-1}, \alpha_{i+1}, \dots, \alpha_n)}{\prod_{1 \leq k < i} (\alpha_i - \alpha_k) \prod_{i < l \leq n} (\alpha_l - \alpha_i)}.$$

Proof. Putting $\lambda = (1^{n-j}, 0^{j-1})$, we have by [16, p.42],

$$\begin{aligned}
A^{-1}(i, j) &= (-1)^{i+j} \frac{\det A(\{j\}', \{i\}')} {\det A} \\
&= (-1)^{i+j} \frac{a_{\lambda+\delta}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{i-1}, \alpha_{i+1}, \dots, \alpha_n)} {\det A} \\
&= \frac{(-1)^{i+j}}{\prod_{1 \leq k < i} (\alpha_i - \alpha_k) \prod_{i < l \leq n} (\alpha_l - \alpha_i)} \frac{a_{\lambda+\delta}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{i-1}, \alpha_{i+1}, \dots, \alpha_n)} {a_{\delta}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{i-1}, \alpha_{i+1}, \dots, \alpha_n)} \\
&= \frac{(-1)^{i+j}}{\prod_{1 \leq k < i} (\alpha_i - \alpha_k) \prod_{i < l \leq n} (\alpha_l - \alpha_i)} S_{\lambda}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{i-1}, \alpha_{i+1}, \dots, \alpha_n) \\
&= \frac{(-1)^{i+j}}{\prod_{1 \leq k < i} (\alpha_i - \alpha_k) \prod_{i < l \leq n} (\alpha_l - \alpha_i)} e_{n-j}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{i-1}, \alpha_{i+1}, \dots, \alpha_n)
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 2.5. Let A be a square matrix of order n with (i, j) entry α_j^{i-1} and Let B be a square matrix of order m with (i, j) entry β_j^{i-1} , where $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ and $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m$ are distinct. Let J, I be index sets of rows and columns, respectively, of $A \otimes B$ such that $J' = \{(n-1, m), (n, m-1), (n, m)\}$, $I' = \{(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2), (i_3, j_3)\}$. Then

$$\frac{\det(A \otimes B)(J, I)}{\det A \otimes B} = \pm \frac{\alpha_{i_1} \beta_{j_2} + \alpha_{i_2} \beta_{j_3} + \alpha_{i_3} \beta_{j_1} - \alpha_{i_1} \beta_{j_3} - \alpha_{i_2} \beta_{j_1} - \alpha_{i_3} \beta_{j_2}}{\prod_{1 \leq r \leq 3} \left(\prod_{1 \leq k < i_r} (\alpha_{i_r} - \alpha_k) \prod_{i_r < l \leq n} (\alpha_l - \alpha_{i_r}) \prod_{1 \leq k < j_r} (\beta_{j_r} - \beta_k) \prod_{j_r < l \leq m} (\beta_l - \beta_{j_r}) \right)}.$$

Proof. We define $f(i, j) = \prod_{1 \leq k < i} (\alpha_i - \alpha_k) \prod_{i < l \leq n} (\alpha_l - \alpha_i) \prod_{1 \leq k < j} (\beta_j - \beta_k) \prod_{j < l \leq m} (\beta_l - \beta_j)$. Using Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\det(A \otimes B)(J, I)}{\det A \otimes B} &= \pm \det(A \otimes B)^{-1}(I', J') \\
&= \pm \det(A^{-1} \otimes B^{-1})(I', J') \\
&= \pm \det \begin{pmatrix} \frac{(-1)^{i_1+n-1+j_1+m} \sum_{i \neq i_1} \alpha_i}{f(i_1, j_1)} & \frac{(-1)^{i_1+n+j_1+m-1} \sum_{j \neq j_1} \beta_j}{f(i_1, j_1)} & \frac{(-1)^{i_1+n+j_1+m}}{f(i_1, j_1)} \\ \frac{(-1)^{i_2+n-1+j_2+m} \sum_{i \neq i_2} \alpha_i}{f(i_2, j_2)} & \frac{(-1)^{i_2+n+j_2+m-1} \sum_{j \neq j_2} \beta_j}{f(i_2, j_2)} & \frac{(-1)^{i_2+n+j_2+m}}{f(i_2, j_2)} \\ \frac{(-1)^{i_3+n-1+j_3+m} \sum_{i \neq i_3} \alpha_i}{f(i_3, j_3)} & \frac{(-1)^{i_3+n+j_3+m-1} \sum_{j \neq j_3} \beta_j}{f(i_3, j_3)} & \frac{(-1)^{i_3+n+j_3+m}}{f(i_3, j_3)} \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \pm \frac{1}{\prod_{1 \leq r \leq 3} f(i_r, j_r)} \det \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{i \neq i_1} \alpha_i & \sum_{j \neq j_1} \beta_j & 1 \\ \sum_{i \neq i_2} \alpha_i & \sum_{j \neq j_2} \beta_j & 1 \\ \sum_{i \neq i_3} \alpha_i & \sum_{j \neq j_3} \beta_j & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \pm \frac{1}{\prod_{1 \leq r \leq 3} f(i_r, j_r)} \det \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{i_1} & \beta_{j_1} & 1 \\ \alpha_{i_2} & \beta_{j_2} & 1 \\ \alpha_{i_3} & \beta_{j_3} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \pm \frac{\alpha_{i_1} \beta_{j_2} + \alpha_{i_2} \beta_{j_3} + \alpha_{i_3} \beta_{j_1} - \alpha_{i_1} \beta_{j_3} - \alpha_{i_2} \beta_{j_1} - \alpha_{i_3} \beta_{j_2}}{\prod_{1 \leq r \leq 3} \left(\prod_{1 \leq k < i_r} (\alpha_{i_r} - \alpha_k) \prod_{i_r < l \leq n} (\alpha_l - \alpha_{i_r}) \prod_{1 \leq k < j_r} (\beta_{j_r} - \beta_k) \prod_{j_r < l \leq m} (\beta_l - \beta_{j_r}) \right)}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

The following is the main theorem of this paper.

Theorem 2.6. *Let $X_i \subset S^{d-1}$ be a spherical t_i -design for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Assume that $X_i \cap X_j = \emptyset$ or $X_i = X_j$, and $X_i \cap (-X_j) = \emptyset$ or $X_i = -X_j$ for $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Let $s_{i,j} = |A(X_i, X_j)|$, $s_{i,j}^* = |A'(X_i, X_j)|$ and $A(X_i, X_j) = \{\alpha_{i,j}^1, \dots, \alpha_{i,j}^{s_{i,j}^*}\}$, $\alpha_{i,j}^0 = 1$, when $-1 \in A'(X_i, X_j)$, we define $\alpha_{i,j}^{s_{i,j}^*} = -1$. We define $R_{i,j}^k = \{(x, y) \in X_i \times X_j \mid \langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_{i,j}^k\}$. If one of the following holds depending on the choice of $i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$:*

- (1) $s_{i,j} + s_{j,k} - 2 \leq t_j$,
- (2) $s_{i,j} + s_{j,k} - 3 = t_j$ and for any $\gamma \in A(X_i, X_k)$ there exist $\alpha \in A(X_i, X_j), \beta \in A(X_j, X_k)$ such that the number $p_{\alpha,\beta}^j(x, y)$ is independent of the choice of $x \in X_i, y \in X_k$ with $\gamma = \langle x, y \rangle$,
- (3) $s_{i,j} + s_{j,k} - 4 = t_j$ and for any $\gamma \in A(X_i, X_k)$ there exist $\alpha, \alpha' \in A(X_i, X_j), \beta, \beta' \in A(X_j, X_k)$ such that $\alpha \neq \alpha', \beta \neq \beta'$ and the numbers $p_{\alpha,\beta}^j(x, y), p_{\alpha,\beta'}^j(x, y)$ and $p_{\alpha',\beta}^j(x, y)$ are independent of the choice of $x \in X_i, y \in X_k$ with $\gamma = \langle x, y \rangle$,

then $(\coprod_{i=1}^n X_i, \{R_{i,j}^k \mid 1 \leq i, j \leq n, 1 - \delta_{X_i, X_j} \leq k \leq s_{i,j}^*\})$ is a coherent configuration. The parameters of this coherent configuration are determined by $A(X_i, X_j), |X_i|, t_i, \delta_{X_i, X_j}, \delta_{X_i, -X_j}$, and when $s_{i,j} + s_{j,k} - 3 = t_j$ (resp. $s_{i,j} + s_{j,k} - 4 = t_j$), the numbers $p_{\alpha,\beta}^j(x, y)$ (resp. $p_{\alpha,\beta}^j(x, y), p_{\alpha',\beta}^j(x, y), p_{\alpha,\beta'}^j(x, y)$) which are assumed be independent of (x, y) with $\langle x, y \rangle = \gamma$.

Proof. Let $x \in X_i, y \in X_k$ be such that $\gamma = \langle x, y \rangle$. It is sufficient to show that the number $p_{\alpha,\beta}^j(x, y)$ depends only on γ and does not depend on the choice of $x \in X_i, y \in X_k$ satisfying $\gamma = \langle x, y \rangle$.

For the ease of notation, let $\alpha_l = \alpha_{i,j}^l$ and $\beta_m = \alpha_{j,k}^m$.

We define a mapping $\phi_l : S^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{h_l}$ by $\phi_l(x) = (\varphi_{l,1}(x), \dots, \varphi_{l,h_l}(x))$. Let H_l be the l -th characteristic matrix of X_j . For any non-negative integers λ and μ satisfying $\lambda + \mu \leq t_j$, we calculate

$$\left(\sum_{l=1}^{\lambda} f_{\lambda,l} \phi_l(x) H_l^t \right) \left(\sum_{m=1}^{\mu} f_{\mu,m} H_m \phi_m(y)^t \right)$$

in two different ways.

First we use Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.1 in turn, to obtain the following equality:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{l=1}^{\lambda} f_{\lambda,l} \phi_l(x) H_l^t \right) \left(\sum_{m=1}^{\mu} f_{\mu,m} H_m \phi_m(y)^t \right) &= |X_j| \sum_{l=1}^{\min\{\lambda, \mu\}} f_{\lambda,l} f_{\mu,l} \phi_l(x) \phi_l(y)^t \\ &= |X_j| \sum_{l=1}^{\min\{\lambda, \mu\}} f_{\lambda,l} f_{\mu,l} Q_l(\langle x, y \rangle) \\ &= |X_j| F_{\lambda, \mu}(\langle x, y \rangle). \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

Next using Lemma 2.1, we obtain the following equality:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{l=1}^{\lambda} f_{\lambda,l} \phi_l(x) H_l^t \right) \left(\sum_{m=1}^{\mu} f_{\mu,m} H_m \phi_m(y)^t \right) \\ = \sum_{z \in X_j} \left(\sum_{l=1}^{\lambda} f_{\lambda,l} (\phi_l(x) \phi_l(z)^t) \right) \left(\sum_{m=1}^{\mu} f_{\mu,m} (\phi_m(z) \phi_m(y)^t) \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{z \in X_j} \left(\sum_{l=1}^{\lambda} f_{\lambda,l} Q_l(\langle x, z \rangle) \right) \left(\sum_{m=1}^{\mu} f_{\mu,m} Q_m(\langle z, y \rangle) \right) \\
&= \sum_{z \in X_j} \langle x, z \rangle^{\lambda} \langle z, y \rangle^{\mu} \\
&= \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in A'(X_i, X_j) \\ \beta \in A'(X_j, X_k)}} \alpha^{\lambda} \beta^{\mu} p_{\alpha, \beta}^j(x, y) + p_{1,1}^j(x, y) + \sum_{m=1}^{s_{j,k}^*} \beta_m^{\mu} p_{1, \beta_m}^j(x, y) + \sum_{l=1}^{s_{i,j}^*} \alpha_l^{\lambda} p_{\alpha_l, 1}^j(x, y) \\
&= \sum_{l=1}^{s_{i,j}} \sum_{m=1}^{s_{j,k}} \alpha_l^{\lambda} \beta_m^{\mu} p_{\alpha_l, \beta_m}^j(x, y) \\
&\quad + p_{1,1}^j(x, y) + (-1)^{\mu} p_{1,-1}^j(x, y) + (-1)^{\lambda} p_{-1,1}^j(x, y) + (-1)^{\lambda} (-1)^{\mu} p_{-1,-1}^j(x, y) \\
&\quad + \sum_{m=1}^{s_{j,k}} \beta_m^{\mu} p_{1, \beta_m}^j(x, y) + \sum_{l=1}^{s_{i,j}} \alpha_l^{\lambda} p_{\alpha_l, 1}^j(x, y) + \sum_{m=1}^{s_{j,k}} (-1)^{\lambda} \beta_m^{\mu} p_{-1, \beta_m}^j(x, y) + \sum_{l=1}^{s_{i,j}} \alpha_l^{\lambda} (-1)^{\mu} p_{\alpha_l, -1}^j(x, y) \\
&= \sum_{l=1}^{s_{i,j}} \sum_{m=1}^{s_{j,k}} \alpha_l^{\lambda} \beta_m^{\mu} p_{\alpha_l, \beta_m}^j(x, y) + G_{\lambda, \mu}^{i,j,k}(\gamma), \tag{2.2}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
G_{\lambda, \mu}^{i,j,k}(t) &= \delta_{1,t} \delta_{X_i, X_j} \delta_{X_j, X_k} + (-1)^{\mu} \delta_{-1,t} \delta_{X_i, X_j} \delta_{X_j, -X_k} \\
&\quad + (-1)^{\lambda} \delta_{-1,t} \delta_{X_i, -X_j} \delta_{X_j, X_k} + (-1)^{\lambda+\mu} \delta_{1,t} \delta_{X_i, -X_j} \delta_{X_j, -X_k} \\
&\quad + (1 - \delta_{1,t})(1 - \delta_{-1,t})(\delta_{X_i, X_j} t^{\mu} + \delta_{X_j, X_k} t^{\lambda} + \delta_{X_i, -X_j} (-1)^{\lambda} (-t)^{\mu} + \delta_{X_j, -X_k} (-t)^{\lambda} (-1)^{\mu}).
\end{aligned}$$

We obtain from (2.1) and (2.2):

$$\sum_{l=1}^{s_{i,j}} \sum_{m=1}^{s_{j,k}} \alpha_l^{\lambda} \beta_m^{\mu} p_{\alpha_l, \beta_m}^j(x, y) = |X_j| F_{\lambda, \mu}(\langle x, y \rangle) - G_{\lambda, \mu}^{i,j,k}(\langle x, y \rangle). \tag{2.3}$$

In the case where i, j, k satisfy the assumption (1), for $0 \leq \lambda \leq s_{i,j} - 1$ and $0 \leq \mu \leq s_{j,k} - 1$, (2.3) yields a system of $s_{i,j} s_{j,k}$ linear equations whose unknowns are

$$\{p_{\alpha_l, \beta_m}^j(x, y) \mid 1 \leq l \leq s_{i,j}, 1 \leq m \leq s_{j,k}\}.$$

Its coefficient matrix $A \otimes B$ is nonsingular, where

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ \alpha_1 & \cdots & \alpha_{s_{i,j}} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \alpha_1^{s_{i,j}-1} & \cdots & \alpha_{s_{i,j}}^{s_{i,j}-1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ \beta_1 & \cdots & \beta_{s_{j,k}} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \beta_1^{s_{j,k}-1} & \cdots & \beta_{s_{j,k}}^{s_{j,k}-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore $p_{\alpha_l, \beta_m}^j(x, y)$ for $1 \leq l \leq s_{i,j}$, $1 \leq m \leq s_{j,k}$ depends only on γ and does not depend on the choice of x, y satisfying $\gamma = \langle x, y \rangle$, and is determined by $A(X_i, X_j)$, $A(X_j, X_k)$, γ , $|X_j|$, t_j , δ_{X_i, X_j} , δ_{X_j, X_k} , $\delta_{X_i, -X_j}$, $\delta_{X_j, -X_k}$.

In the case where i, j, k satisfy (2) i.e., for $\langle x, y \rangle = \gamma \in A(X_i, X_k)$, there exist $\alpha_{l^*} \in A(X_i, X_j)$, $\beta_{m^*} \in A(X_j, X_k)$ such that the number $p_{\alpha_{l^*}, \beta_{m^*}}^j(x, y)$ is uniquely determined. The linear equation (2.3) is the following:

$$\sum_{\substack{1 \leq l \leq s_{i,j} \\ 1 \leq m \leq s_{j,k} \\ (l,m) \neq (l^*, m^*)}} \alpha_l^{\lambda} \beta_m^{\mu} p_{\alpha_l, \beta_m}^j(x, y) = |X_j| F_{\lambda, \mu}(\langle x, y \rangle) - G_{\lambda, \mu}^{i,j,k}(\langle x, y \rangle) - \alpha_{l^*}^{\lambda} \beta_{m^*}^{\mu} p_{\alpha_{l^*}, \beta_{m^*}}^j(x, y). \tag{2.4}$$

For $0 \leq \lambda \leq s_{i,j} - 1, 0 \leq \mu \leq s_{j,k} - 1$ and $(\lambda, \mu) \neq (s_{i,j} - 1, s_{j,k} - 1)$, (2.4) yields a system of $s_{i,j}s_{j,k} - 1$ linear equations whose unknowns are

$$\{p_{\alpha_l, \beta_m}^j(x, y) \mid 1 \leq l \leq s_{i,j}, 1 \leq m \leq s_{j,k}, (l, m) \neq (l^*, m^*)\}.$$

The coefficient matrix C_1 of these linear equations is the submatrix obtained by deleting the $(s_{i,j}, s_{j,k})$ -row and (l^*, m^*) -column of $A \otimes B$. Using Lemma 2.4 the determinant of C_1 is, up to sign,

$$\begin{aligned} \det C_1 &= \pm((s_{i,j}, s_{j,k}), (l^*, m^*))\text{-cofactor of } A \otimes B \\ &= \pm((l^*, m^*), ((s_{i,j}, s_{j,k}))\text{-entry of } (A \otimes B)^{-1}) \det A \otimes B \\ &= \pm((l^*, s_{i,j})\text{-entry of } A^{-1}) \times ((m^*, s_{j,k})\text{-entry of } B^{-1}) \det A \otimes B \\ &= \pm \frac{\det A \otimes B}{\prod_{1 \leq k < l^*} (\alpha_{l^*} - \alpha_k) \prod_{l^* < l \leq s_{i,j}} (\alpha_l - \alpha_{l^*}) \prod_{1 \leq k < m^*} (\beta_{m^*} - \beta_k) \prod_{m^* < l \leq s_{j,k}} (\beta_l - \beta_{m^*})}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence C_1 is nonsingular.

Therefore $p_{\alpha_l, \beta_m}^j(x, y)$ for $1 \leq l \leq s_{i,j}, 1 \leq m \leq s_{j,k}, (l, m) \neq (l^*, m^*)$ depends only on γ and does not depend on the choice of x, y satisfying $\gamma = \langle x, y \rangle$, and is determined by $A(X_i, X_j)$, $A(X_j, X_k)$, γ , $|X_j|$, t_j , δ_{X_i, X_j} , δ_{X_j, X_k} , $\delta_{X_i, -X_j}$, $\delta_{X_j, -X_k}$, the number $p_{\alpha_{l^*}, \beta_{m^*}}^j(x, y)$ which is assumed be independent of (x, y) with $\langle x, y \rangle = \gamma$.

In the case where i, j, k satisfy (3) i.e., for $\langle x, y \rangle = \gamma \in A(X_i, X_k)$ there exist $\alpha_{l_1}, \alpha_{l_2} \in A(X_i, X_j)$, $\beta_{m_1}, \beta_{m_2} \in A(X_j, X_k)$ such that the numbers $p_{\alpha_{l_1}, \beta_{m_1}}^j(x, y), p_{\alpha_{l_1}, \beta_{m_2}}^j(x, y), p_{\alpha_{l_2}, \beta_{m_1}}^j(x, y)$ are uniquely determined. The linear equation (2.3) is the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq l \leq s_{i,j} \\ 1 \leq m \leq s_{j,k} \\ (l, m) \neq (l_1, m_1), (l_1, m_2), (l_2, m_1)}} \alpha_l^\lambda \beta_m^\mu p_{\alpha_l, \beta_m}^j(x, y) &= |X_j| F_{\lambda, \mu}(\langle x, y \rangle) - G_{\lambda, \mu}^{i, j, k}(\langle x, y \rangle) - \alpha_{l_1}^\lambda \beta_{m_1}^\mu p_{\alpha_{l_1}, \beta_{m_1}}^j(x, y) \\ &\quad - \alpha_{l_1}^\lambda \beta_{m_2}^\mu p_{\alpha_{l_1}, \beta_{m_2}}^j(x, y) - \alpha_{l_2}^\lambda \beta_{m_1}^\mu p_{\alpha_{l_2}, \beta_{m_1}}^j(x, y). \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

For $0 \leq \lambda \leq s_{i,j} - 1, 0 \leq \mu \leq s_{j,k} - 1$ and $(\lambda, \mu) \neq (s_{i,j} - 2, s_{j,k} - 1), (s_{i,j} - 1, s_{j,k} - 2), (s_{i,j} - 1, s_{j,k} - 1)$, (2.5) yields a system of $s_{i,j}s_{j,k} - 3$ linear equations whose unknowns are

$$\{p_{\alpha_l, \beta_m}^j(x, y) \mid 1 \leq l \leq s_{i,j}, 1 \leq m \leq s_{j,k}, (l, m) \neq (l_1, m_1), (l_1, m_2), (l_2, m_1)\}.$$

The coefficient matrix C_2 of these linear equations is the submatrix obtained by deleting the $(s_{i,j} - 1, s_{j,k}), (s_{i,j}, s_{j,k} - 1), (s_{i,j}, s_{j,k})$ -rows and $(l_1, m_1), (l_1, m_2), (l_2, m_1)$ -columns of $A \otimes B$. Let J, I be index sets of rows and columns, respectively, of $A \otimes B$ such that

$$J' = \{(s_{i,j} - 1, s_{j,k}), (s_{i,j}, s_{j,k} - 1), (s_{i,j}, s_{j,k})\}$$

and

$$I' = \{(l_1, m_1), (l_1, m_2), (l_2, m_1)\}.$$

Setting $(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2), (i_3, j_3)$ to be $(l_1, m_1), (l_1, m_2), (l_2, m_1)$ respectively, we have

$$\alpha_{i_1} \beta_{j_2} + \alpha_{i_2} \beta_{j_3} + \alpha_{i_3} \beta_{j_1} - \alpha_{i_1} \beta_{j_3} - \alpha_{i_2} \beta_{j_1} - \alpha_{i_3} \beta_{j_2} = (\alpha_{l_1} - \alpha_{l_2})(\beta_{m_1} - \beta_{m_2}).$$

Hence C_2 is nonsingular by Lemma 2.5. Therefore $p_{\alpha_l, \beta_m}^j(x, y)$ for $1 \leq l \leq s_{i,j}, 1 \leq m \leq s_{j,k}, (l, m) \neq (l_1, m_1), (l_1, m_2), (l_2, m_1)$ depends only on γ and does not depend on the choice of x, y satisfying $\gamma = \langle x, y \rangle$, and is determined by $A(X_i, X_j)$, $A(X_j, X_k)$, γ , $|X_j|$, t_j , δ_{X_i, X_j} , δ_{X_j, X_k} , $\delta_{X_i, -X_j}$, $\delta_{X_j, -X_k}$, the numbers $p_{\alpha, \beta}^j(x, y)$, $p_{\alpha', \beta}^j(x, y)$, $p_{\alpha, \beta'}^j(x, y)$ which are assumed be independent of (x, y) with $\langle x, y \rangle = \gamma$. $\square$

Several results known for the case $n = 1$ are derived from Theorem 2.6. We consider the case where $n = 1$ and $X = X_1$ is a t -design of degree s . Then $t_1 = t$ and

$$s_{1,1} = \begin{cases} s-1 & \text{if } X \text{ is antipodal,} \\ s & \text{if } X \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Suppose $t \geq 2s - 2$. If X is antipodal, then $t_1 \geq 2s_{1,1}$, and if X is not antipodal, then $t_1 \geq 2s_{1,1} - 2$. Thus X satisfies the assumption (1) of Theorem 2.6, and hence X carries a symmetric association scheme. So Theorem 2.6 contains the first half of [10, Theorem 7.4] as a special case.

Suppose $t = 2s - 3$ and $p_{\gamma,\gamma}(x, y)$ is uniquely determined for any fixed $\gamma = \langle x, y \rangle \in A'(X)$. If X is antipodal, then $t_1 = 2s_{1,1} - 1$, and if X is not antipodal, then $t_1 = 2s_{1,1} - 3$. Thus X also satisfies the assumption (1) or (2) of Theorem 2.6, and hence X carries a symmetric association scheme. So Theorem 2.6 contains the second half of [10, Theorem 7.4] as a special case.

Suppose that $t = 2s - 3$. If X is antipodal, then $t_1 = 2s_{1,1} - 1$. Thus X satisfies the assumption (1) of Theorem 2.6, and hence X carries a symmetric association scheme. So Theorem 2.6 contains [1, Theorem 1.1] as a special case.

Next, we consider triple regularity of a symmetric association scheme. This concept was introduced in connection with spin models [13].

Definition 2.7. Let $(X, \{R_i\}_{i=0}^d)$ be a symmetric association scheme. Then the association scheme X is said to be triply regular if, for all $i, j, k, l, m, n \in \{0, 1, \dots, d\}$, and for all $x, y, z \in X$ such that $(x, y) \in R_i, (y, z) \in R_j, (z, x) \in R_k$, the number $p_{l,m,n}^{i,j,k} := |\{w \in X \mid (w, x) \in R_m, (w, y) \in R_n, (w, z) \in R_l\}|$ depends only on i, j, k, l, m, n and not on x, y, z .

Let $(X, \{R_i\}_{i=0}^d)$ be an association scheme. We define the i -th subconstituent with respect to $z \in X$ by $R_i(z) := \{y \in X \mid (z, y) \in R_i\}$. We denote by $R_{i,j}^k(z)$ the restriction of R_k to $R_i(z) \times R_j(z)$. The following lemma gives an equivalent definition of a triply regular association scheme. We omit its easy proof.

Lemma 2.8. A symmetric association scheme $(X, \{R_i\}_{i=0}^d)$ is triply regular if and only if for all $z \in X$, $(\bigcup_{i=1}^d R_i(z), \{R_{i,j}^k(z) \mid 1 \leq i, j \leq d, 0 \leq k \leq d, p_{i,j}^k \neq 0\})$ is a coherent configuration whose parameters are independent of z .

Let X be a spherical t -design in S^{d-1} with degree s , and $A'(X) = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s\}$. For $z \in X$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, $X_i(z)$ will denote the orthogonal projection of $\{y \in X \mid \langle y, z \rangle = \alpha_i\}$ to $z^\perp = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \langle y, z \rangle = 0\}$, rescaled to lie in S^{d-2} in $z^\perp$. $X_i(z)$ is called the derived design. In fact $X_i(z)$ is a $(t+1-s^*)$ -design by [10, Theorem 8.2], where $s^* = |A'(X) \setminus \{-1\}|$. We define $\alpha_{i,j}^k = \frac{\alpha_k - \alpha_i \alpha_j}{\sqrt{(1-\alpha_i^2)(1-\alpha_j^2)}}$. If $\langle x, z \rangle = \alpha_i, \langle y, z \rangle = \alpha_j$ and $\langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_k$, then the inner product of the orthogonal projection of x, y to $z^\perp$ rescaled to lie in S^{d-2} , is $\alpha_{i,j}^k$.

Corollary 2.9. Let $X \subset S^{d-1}$ be a finite set and $A'(X) = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s\}$. Assume that $(X, \{R_k\}_{k=0}^s)$ is a symmetric association scheme, where $R_k = \{(x, y) \in X \times X \mid \langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_k\}$ ($0 \leq k \leq s$) and $\alpha_0 = 1$. Then

- (1) $A(X_i(z), X_j(z)) = \{\alpha_{i,j}^k \mid 0 \leq k \leq s, p_{i,j}^k \neq 0, \alpha_{i,j}^k \neq \pm 1\}$.
- (2) $X_i(z) = X_j(z)$ or $X_i(z) \cap X_j(z) = \emptyset$, and $X_i(z) = -X_j(z)$ or $X_i(z) \cap -X_j(z) = \emptyset$ for any $z \in X$ and any $i, j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$. And $\delta_{X_i(z), X_j(z)}, \delta_{X_i(z), -X_j(z)}$ are independent of $z \in X$.
- (3) $X_i(z)$ has the same strength for all $z \in X$.

Moreover if the assumption (1), (2) or (3) of Theorem 2.6 is satisfied for $\{X_i(z)\}_{i=1}^s$, and when (i, j, k) satisfies (2) (resp. (3)) the numbers $p_{\alpha, \beta}^j(x, y)$ (resp. $p_{\alpha, \beta}^j(x, y), p_{\alpha, \beta'}^j(x, y), p_{\alpha', \beta}^j(x, y)$) which are assumed to be independent of (x, y) with $\gamma = \langle x, y \rangle$ are independent of the choice of z , then $(X, \{R_k\}_{k=0}^s)$ is a triply regular association scheme.

Proof. Let $z \in X$. (1) is immediate from the definition of $\alpha_{i,j}^k$.

We define $R_{i,j}^k(z) = \{(x, y) \in X_i(z) \times X_j(z) \mid \langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_{i,j}^k\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \{\langle x, y \rangle \mid x \in X_i(z), y \in X_j(z)\} &\ni \pm 1 \\ &\Leftrightarrow \exists k \alpha_{i,j}^k = \pm 1 \text{ and } p_{i,j}^k \neq 0 \\ &\Leftrightarrow \exists k \alpha_{i,j}^k = \pm 1, \text{ and} \\ &\quad \forall x \in X_i(z) \exists y \in X_j(z) \text{ s.t. } (x, y) \in R_{i,j}^k(z) \text{ and} \\ &\quad \forall y \in X_j(z) \exists x \in X_i(z) \text{ s.t. } (x, y) \in R_{i,j}^k(z) \\ &\Leftrightarrow X_i(z) = \pm X_j(z). \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\{\langle x, y \rangle \mid x \in X_i(z), y \in X_j(z)\} = \{\alpha_{i,j}^k \mid 0 \leq k \leq s, p_{i,j}^k \neq 0\}$$

is independent of $z \in X$, (2) holds.

By Lemma 2.2, $X_i(z)$ is a spherical t -design if and only if $\sum_{x,y \in X_i(z)} Q_k(\langle x, y \rangle) = 0$ for $k = 1, \dots, t$. Since the number of $y \in X_i(z)$ satisfying $\langle x, y \rangle = \frac{\alpha_j - \alpha_i^2}{1 - \alpha_i^2}$ is $p_{i,j}^i$ for any $x \in X_i(z)$, the latter condition is equivalent to $\sum_{0 \leq j \leq s} Q_k(\frac{\alpha_j - \alpha_i^2}{1 - \alpha_i^2}) p_{i,j}^i = 0$ for $k = 1, \dots, t$, which is independent of z . Hence $X_i(z)$ has the same strength for all $z \in X$. Therefore (3) holds.

Moreover if the assumption (1), (2) or (3) of Theorem 2.6 is satisfied for $\{X_i(z)\}_{i=1}^s$, then $(\coprod_{i=1}^s X_i(z), \{R_{i,j}^k(z) \mid 0 \leq i, j, k \leq s, p_{i,j}^k \neq 0\})$ is a coherent configuration. Clearly, $|X_i(z)|$ is independent of $z \in X$. Also, $A(X_i(z), X_j(z))$ is independent of $z \in X$ by (1), t_i is independent of $z \in X$ by (3), and $\delta_{X_i(z), X_j(z)}, \delta_{X_i(z), -X_j(z)}$ are independent of $z \in X$ by (2). It follows from Theorem 2.6 that the parameters of the coherent configuration are independent of $z \in X$. Therefore, $(X, \{R_k\}_{k=0}^s)$ is a triply regular association scheme by Lemma 2.8. $\square$

3 Tight designs

Let X be a t -design in S^{d-1} . It is known [10, Theorems 5.11, 5.12] that there is a lower bound for the size of a spherical t -design in S^{d-1} . Namely, if X is a spherical t -design, then

$$|X| \geq \binom{d+t/2-1}{t/2} + \binom{n+t/2-2}{t/2-1}$$

if t is even, and

$$|X| \geq 2 \binom{d+(t-3)/2}{(t-1)/2}$$

if t is odd. If X is a t -design for which one of the lower bounds is attained, then X is called a tight t -design. It was proved in [2, 3, 10] that if X is a tight t -design with degree s in S^{d-1} , then the following statements hold.

- (1) if t is even, then $t = 2s$,
- (2) if t is odd, then $t = 2s - 1$ and X is antipodal,

(3) if $d = 2$, then X is the regular $(t + 1)$ -gon,

(4) if $d \geq 3$, then $t \leq 5$ or $t = 7, 11$.

If X is a tight 11-design in S^{d-1} where $d \geq 3$, then $d = 24$ and X is the set of minimum vectors of the Leech lattice [5]. We consider tight 4-, 5-, 7-designs in S^{d-1} where $d \geq 3$.

Let $X \subset S^{d-1}$ be a tight $2s$ -design, and let $A'(X) = \{\alpha_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq s\}$. For any $z \in X$, $X_i(z)$ is a $t_i := t + 1 - s^* = (s + 1)$ -design in S^{d-2} . Then the degrees $s_{i,j} = |A(X_i(z), X_j(z))|$ satisfy $s_{i,j} \leq s$, and the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned} 2s - 2 \leq s + 1 &\Leftrightarrow s \leq 3 \\ &\Leftrightarrow t = 2, 4, 6. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, if $t = 4$, then $s_{i,j} + s_{j,k} - 2 \leq t_j$ holds, i.e., the assumption (1) of Theorem 2.6 holds for all i, j, k . By Corollary 2.9, we obtain the following result.

Corollary 3.1. *Every tight 4-design carries a triply regular association scheme.*

The same argument shows that a spherical 3-design with degree 2 i.e., a strongly regular graph with $a_1^* = 0$ carries a triply regular association scheme. This is already known (see [9]).

Let $X \subset S^{d-1}$ be a tight $(2s - 1)$ -design, and let $A'(X) = \{\alpha_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq s\}$ where $\alpha_s = -1$. For any $z \in X$ and $i \neq s$, $X_i(z)$ is a $t_i := t + 1 - s^* = (s + 1)$ -design in S^{d-2} .

Then the degrees $s_{i,j} = |A(X_i(z), X_j(z))|$ satisfy $s_{i,j} \leq s - 1$, and the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned} 2s - 4 \leq s + 1 &\Leftrightarrow s \leq 5 \\ &\Leftrightarrow t = 1, 3, 5, 7, 9. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, if $t = 5, 7$, then $s_{i,j} + s_{j,k} - 2 \leq t_j$ holds, i.e., the assumption (1) of Theorem 2.6 holds for all i, j, k . By Corollary 2.9, we obtain the following result.

Corollary 3.2. *Every tight 5- or 7-design carries a triply regular association scheme.*

The same argument shows that an antipodal spherical 3-design with degree 3 carries a triply regular association scheme i.e., subconstituents of a Taylor graph are strongly regular graphs. This is already known (see [6, Theorem 1.5.3]).

4 Derived designs of Q -polynomial association schemes

The reader is referred to [4] for the basic information on Q -polynomial association schemes. The following lemma is used to prove Lemma 4.2.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\mathfrak{X} = (X, \{R_i\}_{i=0}^d)$ be a symmetric association scheme of class d . Let $B_i = (p_{i,j}^k)$ be its i -th intersection matrix, and $Q = (q_j(i))$ be the second eigenmatrix of $\mathfrak{X}$. Then*

$$(Q^t B_i)(h, i) = \frac{k_i q_h(i)^2}{m_h} \quad (0 \leq h, i \leq d).$$

Proof. See [4, p.73 (4.2) and Theorem 3.5(i)]. □

The following lemma gives a property of derived designs of the embedding of a Q -polynomial association scheme into the first eigenspace.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $(X, \{R_i\}_{i=0}^s)$ be a Q -polynomial association scheme, and we identify X as the image of the embedding into the first eigenspace by $E_1 = \frac{1}{|X|} \sum_{j=0}^s \theta_j^* A_j$. Then, for $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ with $\theta_i^* \neq -\theta_0^*$, the derived design $X_i(z)$ is a 2-design in $S^{\theta_0^*-2}$ for any $z \in X$ if and only if $a_1^*(\theta_i^* + 1) = 0$.*

Proof. The angle set of $X_i(z)$ consists of

$$\frac{\frac{\theta_k^*}{\theta_0^*} - \frac{\theta_i^{*2}}{\theta_0^{*2}}}{1 - (\frac{\theta_i^*}{\theta_0^*})^2} = \frac{\theta_0^* \theta_k^* - \theta_i^{*2}}{\theta_0^{*2} - \theta_i^{*2}} \quad (0 \leq k \leq s, p_{i,i}^k \neq 0).$$

Thus, Lemma 2.2 implies that $X_i(z)$ is a 2-design in $S^{\theta_0^*-2}$ if and only if

$$\sum_{j=0}^s Q_k\left(\frac{\theta_0^* \theta_j^* - \theta_i^{*2}}{\theta_0^{*2} - \theta_i^{*2}}\right) p_{i,j}^i = 0 \quad (k = 1, 2),$$

where $Q_k(x)$ is the Gegenbauer polynomial of degree k in $S^{\theta_0^*-2}$.

Since $Q_1(x) = (\theta_0^* - 1)x$, $\sum_{j=0}^s p_{i,j}^j = k_i$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^s \theta_j^* p_{i,j}^i &= (Q^t B_i)(1, i) \\ &= \frac{k_i q_1(i)^2}{m_1} \quad (\text{by Lemma 4.1}) \\ &= \frac{k_i \theta_i^{*2}}{\theta_0^*}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^s Q_1\left(\frac{\theta_0^* \theta_j^* - \theta_i^{*2}}{\theta_0^{*2} - \theta_i^{*2}}\right) p_{i,j}^i &= \frac{\theta_0^* - 1}{\theta_0^{*2} - \theta_i^{*2}} \left(\theta_0^* \sum_{j=0}^s \theta_j^* p_{i,j}^i - \theta_i^{*2} \sum_{j=0}^s p_{i,j}^i \right) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since $Q_2(x) = (\theta_0^* - 1)x^2 - 1$, $\sum_{j=0}^s p_{i,j}^j = k_i$, (4.1) and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^s \theta_j^{*2} p_{i,j}^i &= \sum_{j=0}^s (c_2^* q_2(i) + a_1^* q_1(i) + b_0^* q_0(i)) p_{i,j}^i \\ &= c_2^* (Q^t B_i)(2, i) + a_1^* \frac{k_i \theta_i^{*2}}{\theta_0^*} + \theta_0^* k_i \quad (\text{by (4.1)}) \\ &= c_2^* \frac{k_i q_2(i)^2}{m_2} + k_i \left(\frac{a_1^* \theta_i^{*2}}{\theta_0^*} + \theta_0^* \right) \quad (\text{by Lemma 4.1}) \\ &= k_i \left(\frac{((\theta_i^* - a_1^*) \theta_i^* - \theta_0^*)^2}{(\theta_0^* - a_1^*) \theta_0^* - \theta_0^*} + \frac{a_1^* \theta_i^{*2}}{\theta_0^*} + \theta_0^* \right), \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\sum_{j=0}^s Q_2\left(\frac{\theta_0^* \theta_j^* - \theta_i^{*2}}{\theta_0^{*2} - \theta_i^{*2}}\right) p_{i,j}^i = \frac{\theta_0^* - 1}{(\theta_0^{*2} - \theta_i^{*2})^2} (\theta_0^{*2} \sum_{j=0}^s \theta_j^{*2} p_{i,j}^i - 2\theta_0^* \theta_i^{*2} \sum_{j=0}^s \theta_j^* p_{i,j}^i + \theta_i^{*4} \sum_{j=0}^s p_{i,j}^i) - k_i$$

$$= \frac{k_i a_1^* (\theta_i^* + 1)^2 \theta_0^*}{(\theta_0^* + \theta_i^*)^2 (\theta_0^* - a_1^* - 1)}.$$

Therefore $X_i(z)$ is a 2-design in $S^{\theta_0^*-2}$ if and only if $a_1^*(\theta_i^* + 1) = 0$. $\square$

5 Real mutually unbiased bases

Definition 5.1. Let $M = \{M_i\}_{i=1}^f$ be a collection of orthonormal bases of $\mathbb{R}^d$. M is called real mutually unbiased bases (MUB) if any two vectors x and y from different bases satisfy $\langle x, y \rangle = \pm 1/\sqrt{d}$.

It is known that the number f of real mutually unbiased bases in $\mathbb{R}^d$ can be at most $d/2 + 1$. We call M a maximal MUB if this upper bound is attained. Constructions of maximal MUB are known only for $d = 2^{m+1}$, m odd [7]. Throughout this section, we assume $M = \{M_i\}_{i=1}^f$ is an MUB, put $X^{(i)} = M_i \cup (-M_i)$ and $X = M \cup (-M)$. The angle set of X is

$$A'(X) = \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}, 0, -\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}, -1 \right\}.$$

We set

$$\alpha_0 = 1, \quad \alpha_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}, \quad \alpha_2 = 0, \quad \alpha_3 = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}, \quad \alpha_4 = -1,$$

and we define $R_k = \{(x, y) \in X \times X \mid \langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_k\}$.

Since $X^{(i)}$ is a spherical 3-design in S^{d-1} for any $i \in \{1, \dots, f\}$, X is also a spherical 3-design in S^{d-1} . It is shown in [14] that $(X, \{R_k\}_{k=0}^4)$ is a Q -polynomial association scheme with $a_1^* = 0$. X is imprimitive and the set $\{X^{(1)}, \dots, X^{(f)}\}$ is a system of imprimitivity with respect to the equivalence relation $R_0 \cup R_2 \cup R_4$.

By Lemma 4.2, for any $z \in X$ the derived design $X_i = X_i(z)$ is a $t_i = 2$ -design in S^{d-2} . We define $s_{i,j} = |A(X_i, X_j)|$. Then the matrix $(s_{i,j})_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq 3 \\ 1 \leq j \leq 3}}$ is

$$\begin{pmatrix} 3 & 2 & 3 \\ 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 3 & 2 & 3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

If $s_{i,j} + s_{j,k} - 2 \leq 2$, that is, when

$$(i, j, k) \in \{(1, 2, 1), (1, 2, 2), (1, 2, 3), (2, 1, 2), (2, 2, 1), (2, 2, 2), \\ (2, 2, 3), (2, 3, 2), (3, 2, 1), (3, 2, 2), (3, 2, 3)\},$$

then the assumption (1) of Theorem 2.6 holds. We remark that X_2 is in fact a 3-design because X_2 is a cross polytope in $\mathbb{R}^{d-1}$, but this fact does not improve the proof.

The following Lemma is used to determine intersection numbers of derived designs obtained from MUB.

Lemma 5.2. We define $X_i(x, \alpha) = \{w \in X_i \mid \langle x, w \rangle = \alpha\}$, and $X_i(x, \alpha; y, \beta) = X_i(x, \alpha) \cap X_i(y, \beta)$. Then the following equalities hold:

- (1) $X_i(x, -\alpha) = X_i(-x, \alpha)$,
- (2) $-X_i(x, \alpha) = X_{4-i}(x, -\alpha)$,
- (3) $|X_i(x, \alpha; y, \beta)| = |X_i(-x, -\alpha; y, \beta)| = |X_i(x, \alpha; -y, -\beta)| = |X_{4-i}(x, -\alpha; y, -\beta)|$.

Proof. (1) and (2) are immediate from the definition.

By (1), $X_i(x, \alpha; y, \beta) = X_i(-x, -\alpha; y, \beta) = X_i(x, \alpha; -y, -\beta)$ holds. By (2), $-X_i(x, \alpha; y, \beta) = X_{4-i}(x, -\alpha; y, -\beta)$ holds. This proves (3). $\square$

If $s_{i,j} + s_{j,k} - 3 = 2$, that is, when

$$(i, j, k) \in \{(1, 1, 2), (1, 3, 2), (2, 1, 1), (2, 1, 3), (2, 3, 1), (2, 3, 3), (3, 1, 2), (3, 3, 2)\}, \quad (5.1)$$

Lemma 5.2 implies that the intersection numbers on $X_j(z)$ for $x \in X_i(z)$, $y \in X_k(z)$ are determined by the intersection numbers on $X_1(z)$ for $x' \in X_1(z)$, $y' \in X_2(z)$. And the intersection numbers $p_{\alpha_{1,1}^2, \alpha_{1,2}^1}^1(x, y)$, $p_{\alpha_{1,1}^2, \alpha_{1,2}^3}^1(x, y)$ for $x, y \in X_1(z)$ are uniquely determined by $\gamma = \langle x, y \rangle$ as follows:

$$p_{\alpha_{1,1}^2, \alpha_{1,2}^1}^1(x, y) = \begin{cases} \frac{d}{2} - 1 & \text{if } \langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_{1,2}^1, \\ \frac{d}{2} & \text{if } \langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_{1,2}^3, \end{cases} \quad p_{\alpha_{1,1}^2, \alpha_{1,2}^3}^1(x, y) = \begin{cases} \frac{d}{2} & \text{if } \langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_{1,2}^1, \\ \frac{d}{2} - 1 & \text{if } \langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_{1,2}^3. \end{cases}$$

These numbers are independent of $z \in X$. Hence the assumption (2) of Theorem 2.6 holds for (i, j, k) in (5.1).

If $s_{i,j} + s_{j,k} - 4 = 2$, that is, when

$$(i, j, k) \in \{(1, 1, 1), (1, 1, 3), (1, 3, 1), (1, 3, 3), (3, 1, 1), (3, 1, 3), (3, 3, 1), (3, 3, 3)\}, \quad (5.2)$$

Lemma 5.2 implies that the intersection numbers on $X_j(z)$ for $x \in X_i(z)$, $y \in X_k(z)$ are determined by the intersection numbers on $X_1(z)$ for $x' \in X_1(z)$, $y' \in X_1(z)$. And the intersection numbers $\{p_{\alpha, \beta}^1(x, y) \mid \alpha = \alpha_{1,1}^2 \text{ or } \beta = \alpha_{1,1}^2\}$ are given in Table 1. These numbers are independent of $z \in X$. Hence the assumption (3) of Theorem 2.6 holds for (i, j, k) in (5.2). By Corollary 2.9, we obtain the following result.

Corollary 5.3. *Every MUB carries a triply regular association scheme.*

Table 1: the values of $p_{\alpha, \beta}^1(x, y)$, where $x \in X_1$, $y \in X_1$

(α, β)	$p_{\alpha, \beta}^1(x, y)$
$(\alpha_{1,1}^2, \alpha_{1,1}^2)$	$\begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_{1,1}^1 \\ d - 2 & \text{if } \langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_{1,1}^2 \\ 0 & \text{if } \langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_{1,1}^3 \end{cases}$
$(\alpha_{1,1}^2, \alpha_{1,1}^1), (\alpha_{1,1}^1, \alpha_{1,1}^2)$	$\begin{cases} \frac{d+\sqrt{d}}{2} - 1 & \text{if } \langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_{1,1}^1 \\ 0 & \text{if } \langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_{1,1}^2 \\ \frac{d+\sqrt{d}}{2} & \text{if } \langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_{1,1}^3 \end{cases}$
$(\alpha_{1,1}^2, \alpha_{1,1}^3), (\alpha_{1,1}^3, \alpha_{1,1}^2)$	$\begin{cases} \frac{d-\sqrt{d}}{2} & \text{if } \langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_{1,1}^1 \\ 0 & \text{if } \langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_{1,1}^2 \\ \frac{d-\sqrt{d}}{2} - 1 & \text{if } \langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_{1,1}^3 \end{cases}$

6 Linked systems of symmetric designs

Definition 6.1. Let $(\Omega_i, \Omega_j, I_{i,j})$ be an incidence structure satisfying $\Omega_i \cap \Omega_j = \emptyset$, $I_{j,i}^t = I_{i,j}$ for any distinct integers $i, j \in \{1, \dots, f\}$. We put $\Omega = \bigcup_{i=1}^f \Omega_i$, $I = \bigcup_{i \neq j} I_{i,j}$. (Ω, I) is called a linked system of symmetric (v, k, λ) designs if the following conditions hold:

- (1) for any distinct integers $i, j \in \{1, \dots, f\}$, $(\Omega_i, \Omega_j, I_{i,j})$ is a symmetric (v, k, λ) design,
- (2) for any distinct integers $i, j, l \in \{1, \dots, f\}$, and for any $x \in \Omega_i, y \in \Omega_j$, the number of $z \in \Omega_l$ incident with both x and y depends only on whether x and y are incident or not, and does not depend on i, j, l .

We define the integers σ, τ by

$$|\{z \in \Omega_l \mid (x, z) \in I_{i,l}, (y, z) \in I_{j,l}\}| = \begin{cases} \sigma & \text{if } (x, y) \in I_{i,j}, \\ \tau & \text{if } (x, y) \notin I_{i,j}, \end{cases}$$

where $i, j, l \in \{1, \dots, f\}$ are distinct and $x \in \Omega_i, y \in \Omega_j$.

By [8, Theorem 1], we may assume that

$$\sigma = \frac{1}{v}(k^2 - \sqrt{n}(v - k)), \quad \tau = \frac{k}{v}(k + \sqrt{n}),$$

where $n = k - \lambda$. It is easy to see that $(\Omega, \{R_i\}_{i=0}^3)$ is a 3-class association scheme, where

$$\begin{aligned} R_0 &= \{(x, x) \mid x \in \Omega\}, \\ R_1 &= \{(x, y) \mid x \in \Omega_i, y \in \Omega_j, (x, y) \in I_{i,j} \text{ for some } i \neq j\}, \\ R_2 &= \{(x, y) \mid x, y \in \Omega_i, x \neq y \text{ for some } i\}, \\ R_3 &= \{(x, y) \mid x \in \Omega_i, y \in \Omega_j, (x, y) \notin I_{i,j} \text{ for some } i \neq j\}. \end{aligned}$$

We note that the second eigenmatrix Q is given in [17] as follows:

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & v-1 & (f-1)(v-1) & f-1 \\ 1 & -\sqrt{\frac{(v-1)(v-k)}{k}} & \sqrt{\frac{(v-1)(v-k)}{k}} & -1 \\ 1 & -1 & -f+1 & f-1 \\ 1 & \sqrt{\frac{(v-1)k}{v-k}} & -\sqrt{\frac{(v-1)k}{v-k}} & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$

and hence the Krein matrix $B_1^* = (q_{1,j}^k)_{\substack{0 \leq j \leq 3 \\ 0 \leq k \leq 3}}$ is given as follows:

$$B_1^* = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ v-1 & \frac{k(v-k)(v-2)+(f-1)(2k-v)\sqrt{k(v-k)(v-1)}}{fk(v-k)} & \frac{k(v-k)(v-2)+(v-2k)\sqrt{k(v-k)(v-1)}}{fk(v-k)} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{(f-1)k(v-k)(v-2)+(v-2k)\sqrt{k(v-k)(v-1)}}{fk(v-k)} & \frac{(f-1)k(v-k)(v-2)+(2k-v)\sqrt{k(v-k)(v-1)}}{fk(v-k)} & v-1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore $(\Omega, \{R_i\}_{i=0}^3)$ is a Q -polynomial association scheme. $(\Omega, \{R_i\}_{i=0}^3)$ is imprimitive and the set $\{\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_f\}$ is a system of imprimitivity with respect to the equivalence relation $R_0 \cup R_2$.

In the rest of this section, we assume that $a_1^* = 0$ i.e., $f = 1 + \frac{(v-2)\sqrt{k(v-k)}}{(v-2k)\sqrt{v-1}}$. Examples of linked symmetric designs satisfying this assumption are known for $(v, k, \lambda) = (2^{2m}, 2^{2m-1} - 2^{m-1}, 2^{2m-2} - 2^{m-1})$ with $f = 2^{2m-1}$ for any $m > 1$ [8].

Let X be the embedding of Ω into the first eigenspace. The angle set of X is

$$A'(X) = \left\{ \frac{\theta_k^*}{\theta_0^*} \mid 1 \leq k \leq 3 \right\},$$

and we set $\alpha_k = \theta_k^*/\theta_0^*$. We consider the derived design $X_i(z)$ for $z \in X$. By $a_1^* = 0$, Lemma 4.2 implies $X_i(z)$ is a 2-design in S^{v-3} . We define $s_{i,j} = |A'(X_i(z), X_j(z))|$. Then the matrix $(s_{i,j})_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq 3 \\ 1 \leq j \leq 3}}$ is

$$\begin{pmatrix} 3 & 2 & 3 \\ 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 3 & 2 & 3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $\{\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_f\}$ is a system of imprimitivity, we obtain Table 2, Table 3.

If $s_{i,j} + s_{j,l} - 2 \leq 2$, that is, when

$$(i, j, l) \in \{(1, 2, 1), (1, 2, 2), (1, 2, 3), (2, 1, 2), (2, 2, 1), (2, 2, 2), (2, 2, 3), (2, 3, 2), (3, 2, 1), (3, 2, 2), (3, 2, 3)\},$$

then the assumption (1) of Theorem 2.6 holds.

If $s_{i,j} + s_{j,l} - 3 = 2$, that is, when

$$(i, j, l) \in \{(1, 1, 2), (1, 3, 2), (2, 1, 1), (2, 1, 3), (2, 3, 1), (2, 3, 3), (3, 1, 2), (3, 3, 2)\}, \quad (6.1)$$

Table 2 implies that the numbers $p_{\alpha_{i,j}^2, \alpha_{j,l}^1}^j(x, y)$ or $p_{\alpha_{i,j}^1, \alpha_{j,l}^2}^j(x, y)$ are independent of $z \in X$ and $(x, y) \in X_i(z) \times X_l(z)$ with $\gamma = \langle x, y \rangle$. Hence the assumption (2) of Theorem 2.6 holds for (i, j, l) in (6.1).

If $s_{i,j} + s_{j,l} - 4 = 2$, that is, when

$$(i, j, l) \in \{(1, 1, 1), (1, 1, 3), (1, 3, 1), (1, 3, 3), (3, 1, 1), (3, 1, 3), (3, 3, 1), (3, 3, 3)\}, \quad (6.2)$$

Table 3 implies the numbers $p_{\alpha_{i,j}^2, \alpha_{j,l}^2}^j(x, y)$, $p_{\alpha_{i,j}^2, \alpha_{j,l}^1}^j(x, y)$ and $p_{\alpha_{i,j}^1, \alpha_{j,l}^2}^j(x, y)$ are independent of $z \in X$ and $(x, y) \in X_i(z) \times X_l(z)$ with $\gamma = \langle x, y \rangle$. Hence the assumption (3) of Theorem 2.6 holds for (i, j, l) in (6.2). By Corollary 2.9, we obtain the following result.

Corollary 6.2. *Every linked system of symmetric design satisfying $f = 1 + \frac{(v-2)\sqrt{k(v-k)}}{(v-2k)\sqrt{v-1}}$ carries a triply regular association scheme.*

Table 2: the values of $p_{\alpha, \beta}^j(x, y)$, where $x \in X_i(z)$, $y \in X_l(z)$

(i, j, l)	(α, β)	$p_{\alpha, \beta}^j(x, y)$	(i, j, l)	(α, β)	$p_{\alpha, \beta}^j(x, y)$
$(1, 1, 2)$	$(\alpha_{1,1}^2, \alpha_{1,2}^1)$	$\begin{cases} \lambda - 1 & \langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_{1,2}^1 \\ \lambda & \langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_{1,2}^3 \end{cases}$	$(2, 1, 1)$	$(\alpha_{2,1}^1, \alpha_{1,1}^2)$	$\begin{cases} \lambda - 1 & \langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_{2,1}^1 \\ \lambda & \langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_{2,1}^3 \end{cases}$
$(1, 3, 2)$	$(\alpha_{1,3}^2, \alpha_{3,2}^1)$	$\begin{cases} k - \lambda & \langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_{1,2}^1 \\ k - \lambda & \langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_{1,2}^3 \end{cases}$	$(2, 3, 1)$	$(\alpha_{2,3}^1, \alpha_{3,1}^2)$	$\begin{cases} k - \lambda & \langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_{2,1}^1 \\ k - \lambda & \langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_{2,1}^3 \end{cases}$
$(3, 1, 2)$	$(\alpha_{3,1}^2, \alpha_{1,2}^1)$	$\begin{cases} \lambda & \langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_{3,2}^1 \\ \lambda & \langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_{3,2}^3 \end{cases}$	$(2, 1, 3)$	$(\alpha_{2,1}^1, \alpha_{1,3}^2)$	$\begin{cases} \lambda & \langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_{2,3}^1 \\ \lambda & \langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_{2,3}^3 \end{cases}$
$(3, 3, 2)$	$(\alpha_{3,3}^2, \alpha_{3,2}^1)$	$\begin{cases} k - \lambda - 1 & \langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_{3,2}^1 \\ k - \lambda & \langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_{3,2}^3 \end{cases}$	$(2, 3, 3)$	$(\alpha_{2,3}^1, \alpha_{3,3}^2)$	$\begin{cases} k - \lambda - 1 & \langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_{2,3}^1 \\ k - \lambda & \langle x, y \rangle = \alpha_{2,3}^3 \end{cases}$

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Professor Akihiro Munemasa for helpful discussions. This work was supported by Grant-in-Aid for JSPS Fellows.

References

- [1] E. Bannai, E. Bannai, On antipodal spherical t -designs of degree s with $t \leq 2s - 3$, arXiv:math/0802.2905v1[math.CO].
- [2] E. Bannai, R. M. Damerell, Tight spherical designs I, J. Math. Soc. Japan 31 (1980), 199–207.
- [3] E. Bannai, R. M. Damerell, Tight spherical designs II, J. London Math. Soc. 21 (1980), 13–30.
- [4] E. Bannai, T. Ito, Algebraic Combinatorics I: Association Schemes, Benjamin/Cummings, Menro Park, CA, 1984.
- [5] E. Bannai, N. J. A. Sloane, Uniqueness of certain spherical codes, Canad. J. Math. 33, (1981), no. 2, 437–449.
- [6] A. E. Brouwer, A. M. Cohen, A. Neumaier, Distance-Regular Graphs, Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, 1989.
- [7] A. R. Calderbank, P. J. Cameron, W. M. Kantor, J. J. Seidel, $\mathbb{Z}_4$ -Kerdock codes, orthogonal spreads, and extremal Euclidean line-sets, Proc. London Math. Soc.(3) 75 (1997), 436–480.
- [8] P. J. Cameron, On groups with several doubly transitive permutation representation, Math. Z. 128, (1972), 1–14.
- [9] P. J. Cameron, J. M. Goethals, J. J. Seidel, Strongly regular graphs having strongly regular subconstituents, J. Algebra 55 (1978), 257–280.
- [10] P. Delsarte, J. M. Goethals, J. J. Seidel, Spherical codes and designs, Geom. Dedicata 6 (1977), 363–388.
- [11] D. G. Higman, Coherent algebras, Linear Algebra Appl. Vol. 93 (1987), 209–239.
- [12] R. A. Horn, C. R. Johnson, Matrix Analysis, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990.
- [13] F. Jaeger, On spin models, triply regular association schemes, and duality, J. Algebraic Combin. 4 (1995), no. 2, 103–144.
- [14] N. LeCompte, W. J. Martin, W. Owens, On the equivalence between real mutually unbiased bases and a certain class of association schemes, preprint.
- [15] W. J. Martin, M. Muzychuk, J. Williford, Imprimitive cometric association schemes: constructions and analysis, J. Algebraic Combin. 25 (2007), 399–415.
- [16] I. G. Macdonald, Symmetric Functions and Hall Polynomials (Second edition), Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1995.
- [17] R. Mathon, The systems of linked 2-(16, 6, 2) designs, Ars Comb, 11 (1981), 131–148.
- [18] R. Noda, On homogeneous systems of linked symmetric designs, Math. Z. 138 (1974) 15–20.

